UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 Larry Hardnett,

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

14

18

19

20

21

Case No. 2:21-cv-00941-JAD-DJA

Plaintiff

v.

State of Nevada, et. al.,

Defendants

Order Dismissing and Closing Case

Plaintiff Larry Hardnett, an inmate at the Southern Desert Correctional Center, submitted an incomplete in forma pauperis application and an exparte motion for appointment of counsel.¹ On May 19, 2021, this Court ordered the plaintiff to file a complaint and either pay the \$402 12 filing fee or file a complete in forma pauperis application by July 19, 2021. That deadline 13 expired without the filing of a complaint and a new application or payment of the filing fee.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of 15 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. A 16 court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁴ In determining whether to dismiss an action

¹ ECF Nos. 1, 1-1

² ECF No. 2.

³ Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

⁴ See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440– 41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the

court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff's claims. The

The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the

on one of these grounds, the court must consider: (1) the public's interest in expeditious

defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the

third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a

presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading

ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. A court's warning to a party that its failure to

alternatives" requirement, 7 and that warning was given here. 8 The fourth factor—the public

JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE. No other documents may be filed in

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED without prejudice

4

availability of less drastic alternatives.⁵

5

10 obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the fifth factor's "consideration of

11 12 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors

13 14

favoring dismissal.

15 based on the plaintiff's failure to file a complaint and an application to proceed in forma

16 pauperis or pay the filing fee as ordered. The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER 17

18

19

20

22

21 ⁵ Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; Malone, 833 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

⁶ See Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

⁷ Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 F.2d at 132–33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424.

⁸ ECF No 2 at 3.

this now-closed case. If Larry Hardnett wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in 2 a new case, and he must either pay the \$402 filing fee or file a complete in forma pauperis 3 application in that new case. Dated: July 30, 2021 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey